

# OREGON STATE BOARD OF GEOLOGIST EXAMINERS

## MEETING MINUTES

DEC. 4, 2015

### Members Present

Peter Stroud, RG/CEG, Chair  
Kenneth Thiessen, RG/CEG, Vice Chair  
Scott Burns, PhD, RG/CEG  
Hans Feige, RG  
Stephen Tucker, Public Member  
Brad Avy, State Geologist\*

### Staff Present

Christine Valentine, Administrator

### Others Present\*\*

Kyle Martin, AAG, Dept. Justice

(\*Ex Officio member, did not vote on motions. \*\* Participation as noted in minutes.)

LOCATION: Association Center, 707 13<sup>th</sup> St. SE, Salem, OR. 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Conf. Room "A"

### Welcome/Introductions

Chair Stroud convened the Board at 9:12 AM. Steve Tucker was absent. All other Board members were present along with Board Administrator Valentine. First order of business was to welcome new State Geologist Brad Avy. Avy's appointment by the Dept. of Geology and Minerals Industry (DOGAMI) Governing Board was effective Dec. 1, 2015. Board members and staff introduced themselves in terms of professional backgrounds and roles with OSBGE. Burns spoke to the public member position in Tucker's absence. Avy shared background on his career in geology and move into government administration. Tucker arrived at 9:22 AM and introduced himself to Avy.

### Meeting Agenda Review

Chair Stroud invited discussion on the agenda. Valentine noted that the Old Business item for an update on the State Geologist recruitment was no longer needed. She also noted that the AAG would arrive at 12:30 PM. Feige noted that he would need to step out at 9:30 for a business call. There were no other comments or changes.

### Minutes

Chair Stroud opened review of the meeting minutes and asked if there were any comments. No edits were requested. Burns and Feige mentioned their appreciation for the detailed meeting minutes. Valentine shared with Avy the Board's protocols for voting on motions with respect to the State Geologist serving as a non-voting Ex Officio member.

*Burns moved to approve the Sept. 10, 2015 public session meeting minutes. Vice Chair Thiessen seconded the motion. Chair Stroud verified that there was no further discussion and called the vote. All approved the motion.*

Feige stepped out at 9:28 PM and returned at 9:40 after the Consent Agenda discussion.

## **Consent Agenda**

Valentine provided an addendum to the exam and registration portion of the consent agenda that covered decisions from Nov. 14 to Nov. 30, 2015. The purpose was to wrap all exam candidates approved in November 2015 for the March 2016 exams into one consent agenda review. Valentine stated that the deadline for new exam applications was Nov. 18, 2015. Vice Chair Thiessen had a question about one additional registration added to the consent agenda, and Valentine addressed this.

Chair Stroud took a few minutes to provide an overview of the consent agenda process for the benefit of Avy. Valentine explained that the Board follows existing written procedures for application reviews as well as numerous financial checks and balances.

*Burns moved to adopt the consent agenda presented to the Board. Tucker seconded the motion. Vice Chair Thiessen asked Burns to clarify that the motion covered all three components of the consent agenda, and Burns confirmed this. Stroud then clarified for the record that the motion covered exam and registration approvals issued Sept. 11, 2015 through Nov. 13, 2015 and Nov. 14, 2015 through Nov. 30, 2015 and also the quarterly check log covering debits and check payments #3960 – 3988 from August 18, 2015 through Nov. 13, 2015. He then called vote, and all approved.*

Valentine informed the Board that Oct. 2015 exam results arrived just prior to Thanksgiving and that general statistics would be shared as part of Administrator's report.

Valentine recommended consultation with Feige when he returned to the meeting to determine if he had any application review issues outside of the consent agenda that he wanted to discuss with the Board.

## **Administrator Report**

➤ Narrative Report: Valentine referred to the written report and spoke briefly to the following highlights:

◆ For the Oct. 2015 exam administration, all 7 candidates sitting for the national Practice section passed. Of 26 candidates sitting for the national Fundamentals section, 21 passed for an approximately 81% passing rate. No Oregon candidates passed the CEG exam.

◆ Contracts have been signed for the online renewal project, with work now underway to plan and build the new web-based service. In response to questions about schedule, Valentine said testing is anticipated in May 2016 with implementation in early summer 2016 if testing is successful. She mentioned that a separate online payment feature was also planned and covered in a separate contract as a second phase. Chair Stroud inquired about legal costs associated with the drawn out reviews of contract language related to the Board's semi-independent status. Valentine addressed how these costs were kept to a minimum via coordination with the Dept. of Administrative Services E-Gov program.

◆ The DOJ Public Law Conference on Oct. 27-28, 2015 provided a valuable training opportunity. Sessions completed included statutory interpretation, contested case process, and rule writing. Feige also attended on Oct. 28 for rule writing. Feige talked about how he learned some good pointers from the training.

◆ The Budget Committee concurred with implementing the State of Oregon Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) of 2.25% instead of the 2% COLA on Dec. 1, 2015 that was anticipated in the Board's budget. This will keep the OSBGE benefits package consistent with the State of Oregon benefits package. This decision was supported by the cost increase being more than offset by savings in health benefit costs. The one staff partaking of health benefits selected a low cost plan for 2016 which will cost the Board less overall than was budgeted for the 2016 benefit year.

The Board was also updated on an unrelated but additional savings in personal services related to Public Employee Retirement System (PERS) costs. PERS notified agencies in late October that the obligation bond repayment rate was reduced from 6.7% to 6% of payroll effective Nov. 1, 2015. PERS expects the 6% rate to remain at this level through Oct. 31, 2017. The adopted personal services budget assumed the 6.7% rate for the full biennium. Chair Stroud mentioned that the cost-share amount for administrative services was being monitored. Valentine said the payment may need to be reduced later in the biennium.

➤ 2013-2015 Financial Review & 2016 Biennial Report: Valentine reported that the in-house portion of the biennial financial review occurred during the weeks of Oct. 12-16 and 19-23. An exit interview was held Nov. 17, 2015. The Board reviewed the draft financial review report. Valentine said that any Board input on the draft report would be relayed to the CPA.

Feige mentioned how often times those preparing these types of reports have to find things to not as needing improvement no matter how minor. For this reason, he suggested it was always important to consider the feasibility of such recommendations. He was pleased to see that the CPA in this case seemed to be reasonable.

Vice Chair Thiessen asked if the CPA also completed the previous review. Valentine said this was the first time with Powers and explained that the CPA who worked on the last two reviews retired from practice. She mentioned how the semi-independent boards often work together to vet possible CPAs and have found benefits to working with the same CPA considering that all reports are submitted to the same reviewers. The CPA also met requirements set by the Secretary of State's Office. There were no other comments on the draft report from Board members.

Valentine explained that the financial review report becomes a key element of the larger biennial report to the Governor and Legislature that must be submitted no later than April 1, 2016. She committed to sharing a draft of that report with the Board in early to mid-March 2016. She referred to information included in the packet describing the contents for the larger biennial report.

➤ 2015-2017 Budget Update: Valentine reported that revenues and expenses were trending within budget. Renewal revenues were close to ¼ of annual estimate for 4.5 months of the year. She opined that the use of slightly more conservative estimates for renewal revenues in this budget compared to the last appeared to be justified. She also noted that November is a big renewal month and not all revenue for the month was shown in the quarterly budget report due to when the report was prepared. She then commented on the status of particular line items including exam-related, out of state travel, computer software upgrades, computer support, and legal services. Chair Stroud referred to the early mention of tracking the cost share amount for administrative services. There were no other questions from Board members.

➤ 5-Year Comparison of Renewals: The Board reviewed the renewal report.

➤ Update on Investments: The Board reviewed the investment report. Valentine noted that two CDs mature with Edward Jones in early 2016, and those funds will be moved into new CDs at Pioneer Trust Bank per the Board's previous direction. Feige requested that for 2016 meetings staff begin including a report on CDs held at Pioneer Trust Bank.

Valentine asked if there were any questions on other items in the narrative Administrator's Report. Burns referred back to the discussion of exam results and commented on how this high passing rate reflects well on university preparation of students. Burns asked about how exam results are transmitted, and Valentine addressed protocols for keeping results confidential. Chair Stroud asked about exam candidate numbers, and Valentine said large groups seem to come in waves over time. It was noted that regardless of exam candidate numbers, registration total has remained very flat.

The Board then briefly discussed demographics as related to future registrations. Burns referred to a recent article where it was reported that the average age for geologists is 60 years suggesting the Board should expect a retirement waive in the near future. Vice Chair Thiessen noted that at the ASBOG meeting he recently attended it was mentioned that university geology programs are filled to capacity nationwide. Burns said there has been an increased level of interest in this career path, and this is demonstrated in the local university programs. Tucker wondered how many students are staying in geology vs. pursuing more interdisciplinary careers. Burns said that universities try to keep track of this, but it is much easier to do with graduate students than with undergraduate students. The ASBOG task analysis process which is designed to keep the exam aligned with the profession was also mentioned.

Valentine recalled the need to ask Feige if he had anything further on application review that he wanted to discuss with the Board. He had stepped out when the Board concluded its earlier discussion on this topic. Feige said he has been considering how the Board addresses work histories for applicants but did not see that this issue was ripe for discussion. He may continue to monitor but at this juncture there were no outstanding application review issues that required Board discussion.

Burns had a question about qualifying work experience for the engineering geologist certification, specifically whether experience under a geotechnical engineer is accepted. Valentine summarized the current statutory and rule requirement for work experience to be under the supervision of an engineering geologist, either as evidenced by the supervising geologist holding a state specialty certification or as otherwise demonstrated for a supervising geologist working in a state without the specialty certification. Chair Stroud referred to a past case where the Board was open to supervision on projects by a person outside the firm. Valentine also recalled this and noted the challenge for the candidate and Board is how to demonstrate such supervision and credit the experience in terms of project hours. Burns agreed that outside supervision should be accommodated in some manner where there is a written agreement between the candidate and CEG. Valentine noted that issues of responsible charge would have to be spelled out in such an agreement.

Chair Stroud noted that Washington can accept experience under an engineer for the CEG work experience. Vice Chair Thiessen said the same is true in California. Valentine suggested that the Board consider a possible statutory change if it feels the current requirement is too stringent. Avy agreed that this option should not be dismissed. He said the Board should not be afraid of pursuing statutory change if it makes sense to do so. Burns recommended research into the question of whether this experience condition is a possible barrier to those interested in the CEG

specialty. He wondered if there are sufficient opportunities in Oregon to gain experience working under a CEG. The Board discussed that a registrant working in a smaller office may only have engineers to work under. Also discussed was the possibility of pursuing statutory change to allow geotechnical engineers (GEs) to supervise aspiring CEGs. Burns noted that CEGs and GEs routinely work together and also often have been educated together. Burns and Valentine were asked to research the types of firms currently employing CEGs.

Chair Stroud call for a break at 10:29 AM. He reconvened the Board at 10:42 AM.

### **Correspondence**

➤ Request for Reciprocity Agreement: Valentine shared a request from Louisiana Board of Professional Geologists to enter into a reciprocity agreement. The proposed agreement included certain parameters for minimum qualifications that conflicted with Board statutes and rules, such as with respect to examination. Valentine said she would respond to inform that OSBGE cannot enter into such an agreement and provide background information on Board requirements for comity registration.

Vice Chair Thiessen noted that the Louisiana Board did not recognize soil science and asked how this compared to the Board's acceptance of courses. Burns discussed how there are many soil scientists in Louisiana due to environmental conditions and how this is covered by a certification program separate from geologist licensure. Feige said he did not recall issues with soil science courses, with most questions arising from interdisciplinary courses that may have a very small amount of geologic content.

➤ ASBOG Email: Valentine shared an email from the ASBOG Executive Director applauding OSBGE's work on the guideline documents. Vice Chair Thiessen mentioned speaking with Sneyd at the ASBOG meeting he recently attended and that she was appointed as the full-time Executive Director at the annual meeting.

### **Strategic Priorities**

➤ State Agency Outreach: Chair Stroud opened discussion on the Board's state agency outreach efforts. He introduced a draft letter to DEQ management with a brief summary of communications to date with that agency. Vice Chair Thiessen mentioned how his review of the DEQ letter benefitted from his having participated in an outreach effort with Water Resources Dept. (WRD) about the issues addressed in the draft. He said sometimes it does seem that the stamping and signing rules are a better fit for registrants working in the private sector vs. the public sector. He noted some differences in DEQ and WRD included that DEQ employs a more limited number of registrants with few in management positions. He felt the Board's response would help to reinforce within DEQ various nuances of registration as related to public agency work. Chair Stroud spoke to the guidance in the draft letter about review of geologic content and conduct of new geologic work including stamping and signing.

The Board moved into discussion of stamping and signing protocols and how it appears there is benefit to discussing this subject with each agency. State agencies have developed various protocols over the years with apparently little attention from the Board. There was some concern about work perhaps not always being stamped and signed but acknowledgement that so far state agency managers have been respectful of registration and aim to have qualified individuals responsible for geologic work. Open questions were should the Board look at stamping/signing issues, and are the existing stamping/signing rules clear or open to any interpretation. Chair Stroud referred to Board advice that agencies at a minimum should document somehow in the

internal documents the role of registrants in review processes and decisions. Valentine shared an editorial about a public sector engineer found to have been working without a current professional license as an example of how stamping/signing issues can become an issue in the public sector.

Other issues related to stamping/signing were discussed. For example, Valentine said she researched whether stamping/signing by a registrant employed at a state agency would alter civil immunity protections for state employed registrants. This action by a registrant does not alter coverage per conversations with the AAG and DAS Risk Management. Also briefly mentioned was how or if OSBGE might respond to questionable geologic work done as part of the contested case process, such as a registrant's testimony on a geologic matter. The history of stamping/signing protocols at DOGAMI was also briefly discussed with Avy noting this as something he would address after getting acclimated to his new post. Chair Stroud closed this portion of the discussion by suggesting that the Board may ultimately need to consider some special outreach targeted at the unique working environment for registrants employed by state government.

The Board next discussed how DEQ and WRD were asked to help monitor for questionable geologic work, including unlicensed work. The Board continued to encourage referral of potential problems to the Board for review. The Board would then decide if investigation was warranted. Chair Stroud mentioned how existing rules on complaint process might benefit from revisions to set forth process steps. Two topics of interest were processes for referrals vs. signed complaints and Board options for addressing registrants vs. unlicensed practitioners.

Avy said he was pleased to see the Board working with the state agencies in a cooperative manner. He felt this was the most constructive approach for addressing any possible misunderstandings and long-standing protocols and attitudes. He thought the Board could provide a helpful outside source of information for agency managers regarding registration requirements.

Chair Stroud returned briefly to the discussions with DEQ and specifically the Board's interest in participating in the DEQ technical discussion forum in spring 2016. When asked about this event, Vice Chair Thiessen said the forum is generally well attended, and he felt it would be a great opportunity for the Board to share registration-related information. He added that he understands DEQ management to be amenable to working with the Board to educate staff about registration laws and rules. Chair Stroud asked for any final comments on the draft letter to DEQ management. All expressed support for the letter.

Next steps were discussed. The Board decided to continue monitoring of stamping/signing issues but to not pursue changes in current rules prior to completing outreach rounds as these efforts should lead to a more complete picture. As for next agency to engage, Avy asked for more time to get settled before hosting a Board outreach event. ODOT was selected as the next agency to contact.

At 11:25 AM, Chair Stroud called for a lunch break as lunch had arrived. At 12:03 PM, Chair Stroud reconvened the Board.

➤ Continuing Education: Chair Stroud opened discussion on the strategic priority to assess feasibility of a continuing education program. Feige walked the Board members through his efforts to evaluate the possible pursuit of statutory authority for continuing education, including a draft schedule tied to the quarterly meeting schedule that outlined anticipated steps through 2019. The Board discussed the connection between continuing education and its mission to protect

health, safety, and welfare. Board members were in agreement as to the need for registrants to stay abreast of changes in science, technology, laws, and practice-related ethics. Tucker mentioned the value of continuing education that he has seen as a registrant of the Construction Contractors Board (CCB).

Board members discussed how there are not many continuing education programs for geologist registration and how this is in stark contrast to other design professions. For example, engineers, architects, landscape architects, landscape contractors and construction contractors licensed in Oregon are all subject to continuing education requirements by their regulatory boards. At least engineers, architects, and landscape architects are subject to continuing education requirements across the country.

Feige walked through preliminary thoughts on funding elements, ties to renewal procedures, types of continuing education, possible audit procedures, etc. He suggested starting with the continuing education program of the New Hampshire geology board as a model.

The Board discussed how it might conduct outreach about a continuing education effort. Feige said he envisioned a combination of mailings, surveys, and board meeting forums to capture registrants in and outside of Oregon. Avy stressed the need to make the case as to the value of continuing education. Feige suggested he draft some materials and in those explain why the Board was pursuing this along with sufficient information to explain what the program might look like. Vice Chair Thiessen mentioned discussion about continuing education at the recent ASBOG meeting in terms of geologists in some places being put in the shadows of engineers and not being fully respected as a profession. Also he said it seems that the public generally sees value in continuing education requirements for professionals. Feige mentioned that a voluntary approach was considered as a possibly easier path, but instead this just raises a different set of legal issues for the Board. It was noted that research into why other geology boards and other professions started continuing education could be useful as well as looking into details of what type of activities are accepted and how are those tracked. Valentine suggested some options for structured vs. self-directed activities and some possible pros and cons of being conservative or liberal in what is accepted.

Feige referred back to the proposed schedule and noted that by the end of next year, the Board would know if there was sufficient support among registrants for continuing education. Draft outreach materials would be discussed at Board meetings before release. Tucker encouraged Board members to discuss the timing of outreach to registrants and the consensus was that the Board would need time to review outreach materials and build toward engagement.

Vice Chair Thiessen mentioned that registrants with licensure in other states may have already heard about continuing education or already have to complete for another state registration. Burns pointed out that continuing education is not prevalent in the western states so the Board would be leading on this for the west coast if ultimately pursued. Vice Chair Thiessen said he would follow up with Board Member Will Ernst from the Washington Geology Licensing Board about the extent to which that board is looking into continuing education. Chair Stroud volunteered to speak with contacts knowledgeable about the California combined board to see if continuing education for geologists is under any consideration there. Related questions were how stakeholders will react to the proposal, would out-of-state registrants drop Oregon licensure to avoid continuing education requirements, and what can be learned from experiences of other boards.

Chair Stroud brought the conversation to a close by asking Board members if they supported moving forward to the next steps suggested by Feige. All Board members were in favor of this but all were aware of hurdles and the importance of how stakeholders were ultimately engaged.

The Board was joined by Kyle Martin at 12:30 PM.

### **Compliance Report**

Chair Stroud announced that the Board would move to the Compliance Report ahead of other committee reports. Chair Stroud invited Martin's input on Board complaint procedures and ongoing discussions with state agencies about stamping and signing protocols. Martin said it would be helpful to ensure Board rules address all types of complaints and not just signed complaints or complaints against registrants. Chair Stroud noted this would include protocols for how the Board decides to move forward when opening complaints vs. investigating complaints filed with the Board. Martin mentioned how authority to pursue Board-initiated investigations was an issue in a previous revocation case, and the legal rationale can be pulled from the final Board order in that case. As for stamping/signing issues, Martin said the existing requirements are pretty clear and confirmed that the Board needs to have the same policies in place for all registrants regardless of where they work.

Martin addressed the Board's lack of statutory confidentiality for complaints or other materials submitted to the Board. When a person submits something to the Board, this becomes a public record even if what was submitted is not a formal, signed complaint. OSBGE does not currently have the ability to provide confidentiality to those submitting information about potential practice issues. He explained how this varies among boards, with some having high degree of confidentiality required, some have discretion about confidentiality and still others like OSBGE not being able to provide any. The Board discussed how it could look at whether to request statutory change but that messaging for this could be challenging given that open records and transparency are hot topics. Burns asked Martin if he could share some statute examples of confidentiality for complainants. Martin said he would provide a few examples to Valentine for sharing with the Board.

In order to review legal advice regarding newly obtained compliance-related information, Chair Stroud announced at 12:53 PM that the Board was entering Executive Session to review documents exempt by law from public inspection under ORS 192.660(2)(f). He read the script regarding attendance.

At 1:31 PM, Chair Stroud returned the Board to public session. No final decisions were made in Executive Session.

➤ Motions: Chair Stroud asked if there was a motion related to Phase II reports that had recently come to the Board's attention.

*Tucker moved to send a second letter based on additional information that had come to Board's attention to Spear to reiterate Board concerns about geologic practice as part of Phase II reports. Feige seconded the motion. Chair Stroud clarified for the record that the motion was referring to Phase II reports from Charles Spear and Environmental Inspection Services dated 2000 ad 2006 and ongoing Board concern about possible practice of geology. He asked if there was any discussion. Vice Chair Thiessen asked if the Board should request a response to its letters. After brief discussion, this idea was*

*dropped. Chair Stroud confirmed there was no further discussion. He called the vote, and all voted in favor of the motion.*

Tucker volunteered to work with Valentine on the letter of concern.

➤ Open Complaint Case(s): Tucker and Valentine notified the Board that one new complaint had been received in October but was not yet ready for Board review as information was still being gathered. The complaint was filed by one registrant against another registrant. As information develops, the case will be further evaluated and next steps determined.

### **Committee Reports**

➤ CEG Examination: Vice Chair Thiessen reminded the Board that two exam forms are in use, with one reviewed and updated last year. He recommended that the Board consider whether the second form should be reviewed in the coming year. Valentine added that the revised exam form had not been thoroughly tested since there were few candidates for the October 2016 administration. She was aware of one application so far for the March 2016 CEG exam. She mentioned that the staff person for the Washington Dept. of Licensing who was working on exam review, database, and related matters had moved to another position.

Vice Chair Thiessen returned to the Board's earlier discussion about qualifying experience for CEG candidates. Given that California and Washington can accept supervision under engineers, he recommended that Oregon should investigate this possible barrier. Burns agreed citing the limited number of CEGs in Oregon and his view that there are some very good geotechnical engineers working in Oregon who could serve as good mentors for future CEGs. Stroud suggested that this topic be broached at an upcoming meeting of the local chapter of the Association of Engineering and Environmental Geologists (AEG).

Feige asked if the Board knows how many firms there are in Oregon that employ CEGs. If there are enough of such firms, then there should be opportunities for mentorship under CEGs. He wondered how the Board could assess this. Burns volunteered to work with staff to look at CEGs by location and type of firms they work at.

➤ Legislative: Valentine briefly updated the Board on the upcoming 2016 legislative session and the types of issues likely to dominate this short session. She will monitor the session but was not expecting major issues to emerge from the 2016 session for boards. New legislation on some issues such as public records would impact all state agencies.

Valentine shared a recent audit report from the Secretary of State's Office regarding public records with the Board. Governor Brown announced that direction to state agencies would be forthcoming in the form of a Governor's Executive Order. This had not yet been released. Valentine said she would monitor for possible changes to public records management or expectations that could impact OSBGE.

➤ Outreach: Chair Stroud referred to the robust discussion of state agency outreach that occurred earlier in meeting. He asked Burns about an outreach visit to Portland State University (PSU). Burns said he discussed with his colleagues at PSU, and the PSU Geology Department extended a formal invitation to Board. The preferred date for the visit is Thursday June 2, 2016. The AEG student group may be able to assist with the lunch.

Chair Stroud confirmed the Board's interest in moving forward with the idea of a coordination meeting with ODOT.

➤ Rules Advisory: Feige reported that there were no rules for review but that he had a list of potential projects from the day's discussion. He proposed to work on example rules for continuing education first as related to the Board's decision to move towards outreach on this effort. He suggested that the complaint rule be looked at next to address Board-initiated complaints. He confirmed the Board's decision to hold off on evaluation of stamping/signing rules until more state agency outreach meetings could be completed.

➤ Joint Compliance: Chair Stroud referred to the draft meeting notes for the 10/1/15 meeting. He and Vice Chair Thiessen gave some background on issues that came up during the last JCC meeting and how the issues related to questions about the role of the JCC. The current memorandum of agreement charges the JCC with addressing practice overlap in relation to compliance issues. They said there can be questions at times about whether a particular issue about scope of practice raises a compliance issue. The JCC debated how staff should respond to scope of practice questions. A key meeting outcome was agreement to share information timely and flag items for JCC discussion if there is the possibility of practice overlap-related compliance issues.

Burns stepped out at 2:02 PM for several minutes.

Vice Chair Thiessen closed the discussion by saying that he believed OSBGE staff followed appropriate steps in responding to the CEG scope of practice question that was recently reviewed by the JCC. He noted how staff followed long-standing Board precedents with reference also to past JCC efforts and an OSBEELS decision.

### **Public Comment**

Chair Stroud called for a break at 2:11 PM. He reconvened the Board at 2:25 PM and moved to the public comment period. He noted for the record that no one was present to provide comments.

### **Old Business**

➤ ASBOG Mtg. Update: Chair Stroud opened this agenda item by inviting Vice Chair Thiessen to provide an update on the ASBOG Council of Examiners and annual meeting. He noted there had been a lot of changes at ASBOG in the last year. He updated the Board on a new ASBOG committee looking at the financials of the organization and circumstances surrounding the change in Executive Director. An increase in the cost for the Fundamentals exam section was passed, with the fee going from \$150 to \$200. This fee increase was apparently first proposed by ASBOG in 2006 but not acted on. The fee increase goes into effect in 2018.

Vice Chair Thiessen shared information from a presentation by AGI and a related document titled Geoscience for America's Critical Needs. Geoscience funding has been reduced. He also shared a handout with an example of a recent federal rule promulgated by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) that prohibits geologists from certifying compliance with technical requirements related to the federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). Some of the work described in the rule is within the geologist scope of practice. The membership requested that the ASBOG Executive Committee write a letter to EPA about the problem with this RCRA rule. It was noted that this advocacy role was new for ASBOG.

Burns said he was familiar with the AGI document and that it was originally produced to explain geosciences to politicians. The document has turned out to be helpful in explaining geosciences with a much broader audience. Burns said that AGI is the predominant source of data on academic geology programs.

Chair Stroud asked if ASBOG advocates for geologist licensure. Vice Chair Thiessen thought that ASBOG had some canned materials about how to pursue a state registration program as there was mention of ASBOG helping registration advocates in New York State with this. Burns said he thought AEG was working on this nationally.

➤ Exam Proctors: Valentine updated the Board on the status of the proctors list and the need for proctors for the March 2016 exam administration. Burns volunteered to proctor the March exam.

➤ ASBOG Exam Standard: Per Board direction, the ASBOG exam standard document shared at the Sept. 10, 2015 meeting was sent to counsel for review. Several recommendations from counsel were incorporated as shown in “Before” and “After” versions of the document. Staff intends to post the final document on the website and otherwise use when responding to inquiries about the ASBOG exam requirement.

*Feige moved to approve the outreach document titled “ASBOG exam standard” and marked as revision labelled “after”. Burns seconded the motion. Chair Stroud asked if there was any discussion. Hearing none, he called the vote, and all approved.*

### **New Business**

The Board reviewed potential dates for 2016 quarterly meetings. The Board selected the following dates: March 4, June 2, Sept. 16, Dec. 2 with the June 2 meeting to be held at PSU.

### **Announcements**

There were no announcements.

### **ADJOURN (4:00 PM Estimated)**

Chair Stroud adjourned the Board at 3:07 PM.

+++++

The minutes of the December 4, 2015 quarterly meeting were approved with revisions incorporated herein at the March 4, 2016 quarterly Board meeting.

Christine Valentine, Administrator